

THE INDIVIDUAL APPROACH TO CONTACT:
HOW PERSONALITY PREDICTS
INTERGROUP CONTACT
BEHAVIOR

by

Nicole Sharp

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

December 2012

Copyright © by Nicole Sharp 2012

All Rights Reserved



Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge my advisor, Dr. Jared Kenworthy, for all of his help and guidance throughout this process. I would also like to thank Asha Jassani for all of the time she has invested in this project by assisting me with data collection. Furthermore, I would like to thank Vivian Ta, Zach Cureton, and Brandi Cavener for their assistance with data collection.

November 19, 2012

Abstract

THE INDIVIDUAL APPROACH TO CONTACT:
HOW PERSONALITY PREDICTS
INTERGROUP CONTACT
BEHAVIOR

Nicole Sharp, M.S.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2012

Supervising Professor: Jared B. Kenworthy

Personality has been shown to be associated with prejudice levels and intergroup contact has been shown to reduce negative outgroup attitudes and discrimination, but until now the motivating factors that encourage naturalistic contact have not been examined. Participants were recruited from undergraduate introductory psychology courses and partook in a two-part study. During phase 1 of the study, participants completed personality measures as well as intergroup contact and prejudice scales. In the second phase of the study participants rated and selected potential future interaction partners based on an evaluation of short profiles. Results indicated that the Cultural Empathy subscale of the MPQ was the strongest predictor of prejudice. Outgroup approach behavior was not predicted by the MPQ variables, but positive ingroup evaluations were predicted by Cultural Empathy, Open Mindedness, and Emotional Stability. This suggests that individuals more prone to understanding others on an affective level will be less prejudiced than others.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
List of Tables.....	vi
Chapter 1 The Previous Literature.....	1
The Social Psychology Approach: What Reduces Prejudice?.....	1
The Personality Approach: What Predicts Prejudice and Contact?.....	4
Multicultural Personality Questionnaire – Alternative Method of Predicting Contact.....	7
Overview and Hypotheses.....	9
Chapter 2 Method – The way in which Personality, Approach Behavior, and Prejudice were measured	10
Phase 1: Prescreening Survey.....	10
Phase 2: Behavioral Assessment.....	12
Procedure.....	13
Chapter 3 Results – What was found?	16
Phase 1 Results: Personality Predicts Prejudice Attitudes.....	17
Phase 2 Results: Personality Predicts Approach Behaviors.....	21
Chapter 4 Discussion and Conclusions – MPQ predicts prejudice but not always Approach Behaviors.....	24
Appendix A Multicultural Personality Questionnaire.....	28
Appendix B Right Wing Authoritarianism.....	34
Appendix C Social Dominance Orientation Scale.....	37
Appendix D The Big Five Inventory.....	39
Appendix E Intergroup Contact.....	43
Appendix F In-group Identification.....	46
References.....	48

Biographical information.....	54
-------------------------------	----

List of Tables

Table 1 Descriptive statistics for MPQ, Big Five, RWA, and SDO	11
Table 2 Descriptive statistics for prejudice variables.....	16
Table 3 Correlation matrix for predictor and control variables	17
Table 4 Hierarchical multiple regression analyses predicting prejudice attitudes towards African Americans.....	18
Table 5 Hierarchical multiple regression analyses predicting prejudice attitudes towards Caucasians.....	19
Table 6 Hierarchical multiple regression analyses predicting prejudice attitudes towards Hispanics.....	20
Table 7 Hierarchical multiple regression analyses predicting prejudice attitudes towards Asians.....	21
Table 8 Correlation matrix for criterion variables.....	22

Chapter 1

The Previous Literature

Intergroup relations researchers have spent a considerable amount of time identifying the factors that contribute to and exacerbate, as well as reduce or eliminate, prejudice and discrimination. This research has generally been pursued through one of two directions: situation-based research (social psychology) or individual differences-based research (personality psychology). On the one hand, social psychologists have focused on the moderators and mediators that influence the quality, quantity, and generalization of contact as well as the reduction of prejudice. On the other hand, personality psychologists have explored the associations between individual differences in traits, attitudes, and values on the one hand and prejudice levels. Among the individual differences variables that have been studied are social dominance orientation (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), right wing authoritarianism (Alteymeyer, 1998), and recently, the Big Five (Duckitt, Wagner, Plessis, & Birum, 2002; Sibley and Duckitt, 2008). In general, the purpose of the present research is to address the question of how personality interacts with intergroup situations to predict intergroup contact behavior.

The Social Psychology Approach: What Reduces Prejudice?

Prejudice, by definition, is an attitude (Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991), and not necessarily a specific behavior, such as engaging in intergroup contact or displaying discrimination. Individuals' prejudice levels have consistently been shown to decrease after they engage in outgroup contact (Binder et al., 2009; Pettigrew & Troop, 2006). Following Allport's (1954) original Contact Hypothesis, many other models for optimal intergroup contact and

prejudice reduction have been proposed, such as decategorization, category salience, social identity theory, and crossed categorization.

Decategorization and Category Salience. Brewer and Miller (1984) and Hewstone and Brown (1986) addressed the issue of classification of the outgroup member within their decategorization and category salience models, respectively. According to the decategorization model (Brewer & Miller, 1984), optimal intergroup contact will occur when group membership salience is reduced, thereby making the interaction more personalized than in typical intergroup encounters. Personalized contact (Miller, 2002) allows for alternative perspectives to form about the interaction partner's group and ultimately reduces stereotyping and prejudice. An alternative to this model was Hewstone and Brown's (1986; see also Brown & Hewstone, 2005) category salience model, which stressed that generalization of positive attitudes to the outgroup would be inhibited unless the interaction partners' respective group memberships remained salient.

Social identity theory. Not only does outgroup categorization affect prejudice levels, but the way individuals categorize themselves influences their intergroup attitudes and behaviors as well. According to Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), when an individual classifies themselves as group members their unique identities become depersonalized and more prototypical of the group. High ingroup identifiers, as compared to low ingroup identifiers, have been shown to report more positive attitudes toward the ingroup (Cairns, Kenworthy, Campbell, & Hewstone, 2006), more negative attitudes toward the outgroup (Lindemann, 1997), and perceive more homogeneity within both the ingroup and the outgroup (Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1997). From these findings, it follows that if a group encourages prejudice and discrimination, then the individual who identifies with the group will also tend to endorse or

support these attitudes and behaviors. By the same logic, however, if a group encourages intergroup acceptance and equality, individual group members should also mirror those attitudes.

Crossed Categorization. Taking ingroup identification a step further to include multiple group memberships results in the idea of crossed categorization (Brewer et al., 1987; Crisp & Hewstone, 2000). Humans are inherently multidimensional. As such, it is difficult to categorize an individual into just one simple, overarching category. The idea of crossed categorization explores intergroup evaluations on two or more dichotomies (group memberships) in which two individuals can either be a double ingroup member (II), both an ingroup and an outgroup member (IO, OI), or a double outgroup member (OO). These crossed categorizations have been postulated to reduce prejudice by either decreasing category differentiation or decreasing group identification (Brewer & Miller, 1984; Hewstone et al., 1993; Urada, Stenstrom, & Miller, 2007), thus operating in a similar way as recategorization. Unfortunately, and for various reasons, crossed categorization using the two-group membership model is not always successful at reducing prejudice (Crisp & Hewstone, 1999).

Allport's contact hypothesis. Along with the limited success of these more recent theoretical models in changing negative outgroup attitudes, intergroup contact itself has been shown to be highly successful in reducing prejudice when at least one of Allport's four original criteria (equal status, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and support of authorities) is present (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Troop, 2006). Evidence suggests that intergroup contact successfully reduces prejudice through mediators such as reducing intergroup anxiety (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008; Stephan & Stephan, 1985), increased knowledge of the outgroup (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008), and increased empathy and perspective-taking with the outgroup (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008; Vescio, Schrist, & Paolucci, 2003).

Intergroup anxiety is a negative state that is experienced when one interacts or anticipates interacting with an outgroup member. This negative emotion stems from the expectation of negative consequences during intergroup interactions (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Intergroup anxiety has been found to significantly mediate the relationships between outgroup contact and both attitudes and perceived outgroup variability (Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). High levels of anxiety are associated with a narrowed focus of attention and an oversimplified schematic of the outgroup (Wilder & Simon, 1998), and may continue to influence the relationship between current contact and volitional future contact.

Despite all of the evidence that contact can help reduce prejudice, prejudice levels still predict the amount and type of contact an individual will engage in. Binder et al. (2009) conducted a longitudinal study with school-age children in three countries (Germany, Belgium, and England) to determine the effects of quality and quantity of intergroup contact on prejudice levels and vice versa. Both the quality and quantity of contact reduced prejudice levels over time when controlling for previous prejudice levels for majority group members, but prejudice also reduced contact when applying the same controls. Even though intergroup anxiety has shown mediating effects, the bidirectionally causal relationship between prejudice and contact is still not well understood. The present research aims to further explore this link.

The Personality Approach: What Predicts Prejudice and Contact?

Intergroup contact predicts prejudice and prejudice predicts contact, but very few other predictors of contact have been proposed or examined. One alternative that has received some attention is the moderating effect of personality on the relationship between contact and prejudice (Hodson, 2008; 2009). Personality characteristics provide the basic motivations for behavior in many situations (Winter, John, Stewart, Klohnen, & Duncan, 1998). As such, they

may motivate some individuals to be more willing to engage in outgroup contact, whereas they may motivate others to avoid it. Much of the research concerning the associations between personality and prejudice has focused on the characteristics that predict prejudiced attitudes, but do not evaluate the likelihood of engaging in either negative, discriminatory behavior or positive, approach behavior. Although related, these approach or avoidant behaviors are not synonymous with prejudice, as evidenced by Dovidio, Brigham, Johnson, and Gaertner (1996)'s findings of a moderate correlation between prejudice and discrimination ($r = .32$) and even smaller correlations between (a) stereotyping and prejudice and (b) stereotyping and discrimination ($r = .25$, and $r = .16$, respectively).

Within the personality literature, Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA; Altemeyer, 1998) and Social Dominance Orientation (SDO; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) have repeatedly been shown to relate to prejudice. According to Altemeyer (1981, 1998), RWA is characterized by conventionalism (strict adherence to conventional norms and values), authoritarian submission (unquestioning subjection to authority), and authoritarian aggression (aggressive feelings toward norm violators). SDO is characterized by a competitive motivation for dominance, superiority, and power over other groups (Asbrock, Sibley, & Duckitt, 2010).

In certain situations, some individuals have characteristics that make them more prone to prejudice and discrimination. Danso and Esses (2001) found that white participants high in SDO displayed improved performance when tested by black experimenters than when tested by white experimenters, suggesting that the intergroup environment stimulated more competition from these participants. In another experiment, Esses, Dovidio, Jackson, and Armstrong (2001) tried to change outgroup attitudes by directly challenging participants' zero-sum beliefs through

cognitive interventions. Those high in SDO actually had the inverse reaction, reporting more negative attitudes after the manipulation. Examining the impact of personality on contact, Hodson (2008) found that SDO significantly moderated the influence of contact quality and quantity when predicting in-group bias. Specifically, among incarcerated adults, those high in SDO who perceived institutional contact conditions as favorable and supportive exhibited less bias than high SDO individuals who did not perceive these conditions. Furthermore, high SDO participants who engaged in more frequent contact experienced less bias. These studies indicate that some individuals do, in fact, react to situations differently than others. Yet, prejudice and discrimination are not fully explained by SDO in and of itself.

Although SDO and RWA have historically been researched independently, some researchers have argued that they are simply measuring two sides of prejudice and should be looked at within the same model. For example, Duckitt, Wagner, Plessis, and Birum (2002) proposed a dual processes model, according to which general prejudice is subdivided into categories depending on the classification of the outgroups. Within the model, RWA specifically targets prejudice towards dangerous groups while SDO targets prejudice towards subordinate groups (Asbrock et al., 2010; Duckitt et al., 2002). Underlying these different motivations are the personality dimensions of Openness to experience and Agreeableness. Those who are low in Openness are more prone to high levels of RWA because of their general fear of outside threat. Disagreeable individuals are more prone to high levels of SDO because they want to maintain their own superiority rather than get along with others (Asbrock et al., 2010). The associations between the Big Five characteristics (particularly low openness to experience and low agreeableness), RWA, and SDO predicting prejudice were further validated by Sibley and

Duckitt (2008) in their meta-analytic review of the literature examining the association between personality and prejudice.

Multicultural Personality Questionnaire – Alternative Method of Predicting Contact

Prejudice, and more importantly discriminatory behavior, is not predicted by only one trait or characteristic, as the literature reviewed above has shown. Most of the research has focused on the types of characteristics that breed negative attitudes and behavior, but the factors that encourage naturally occurring approach behaviors (contact) have not been explored. One potential personality dimension candidate that has been recently developed and validated is the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000). This questionnaire was designed to measure multicultural effectiveness and adaptation, and the degree to which an individual will be successful and maintain a high level of well-being within an international setting. In other words, it measures how well a person adapts to new surroundings once they are submersed in them. The instrument consists of four subscales that were originally created by expanding upon the Big Five (openness to experience, conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism): open-mindedness, cultural empathy, social initiative, flexibility, and emotional stability (Van der Zee, & Van Oudenhoven, 2000; Leone, Van der Zee, van Oudenhoven, Perugini, & Ercolani, 2005).

Open-mindedness, defined as an open and unprejudiced attitude toward different cultural norms and values, is theorized to encourage approach behaviors. Open-minded individuals are less inclined to harbor negative stereotypes and instead are more curious about outgroup members (Van der Zee, 2004). This curiosity should promote approach behavior, because an effective way to learn about another culture is to actively interact with members from that group.

Social Initiative – the tendency to actively approach social situations and to take initiatives – when combined with open-mindedness, may produce the ideal personality trait combination to predict approach behavior. Individuals must be first willing to engage in voluntary outgroup contact but then must also have enough initiative to seek out that interaction as well. Within the MPQ literature, social initiative and openness have been shown to significantly correlate with multicultural activity (defined by the number of holidays spent abroad, number of languages spoken, and number of international friends; Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000), providing further support for this expectation.

The other three dimensions (cultural empathy, emotional stability, and flexibility) are traits that influence how an interaction takes place once it is underway, but may have less direct influence on the approach motivations necessary to begin or initiate that contact. Cultural empathy refers to one's ability to accurately perceive and reflect the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of members from other cultures, thus allowing for reduced miscommunication between group members (Van der Zee, 2004). Emotional stability is defined as a tendency to remain calm in stressful situations rather than display strong emotional reactions (Van der Zee, 2004). The fifth dimension, flexibility, refers to the tendency and ability to adjust one's behavioral strategies within a foreign culture (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000; Van der Zee, Zaal, & Piekstra, 2003).

The MPQ has been used both as a series of subscales as well as a unidimensional construct to predict multicultural effectiveness (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000). The combined MPQ subscales predicted multicultural involvement, inspiration for an international career, and international orientation above and beyond the Big Five ($\Delta R^2 = .14, .22, \text{ and } .28$ respectively; Van der Zee, & Van Oudenhoven, 2000). Overall, this scale has been shown to aid

in the identification of individuals who are more open to other cultural experiences and who can adapt more readily when placed in a culture outside of their own, particularly for work-related environments. Nesdale, Van Oudenhoven, and Pieter (2012) introduced the MPQ into the prejudice literature by examining the extent to which intercultural effectiveness predicted prejudiced attitudes of Australians towards the indigenous population. They found an inverse relationship between the MPQ subscales and prejudice. Despite the extensive psychometric testing and validation of the MPQ, it has not been tested in a behavioral setting. As a measure of intercultural approach, the dimensions of the MPQ may identify the key characteristics that make intergroup contact both likely and successful for some individuals.

Overview and Hypotheses

The present study consisted of two phases; an initial phase of personality measures and a follow-up (behavioral) selection phase. During the second phase participants rated potential interaction partners based on their preference for working with them to determine their willingness to engage in intergroup approach behaviors. Based on the logic presented above, I hypothesized that the MPQ would predict prejudice and approach behavior above and beyond SDO, RWA, and the traditional Big Five. Of the subscales of the MPQ, open-mindedness, emotional stability, and cultural empathy were predicted to be the strongest predictors of prejudice. Of the subscales of the MPQ, open mindedness and social initiative were predicted to be the strongest predictors of approach behavior.

Chapter 2

Method – The way in which Personality, Approach Behavior, and Prejudice were measured

Participants and Design

Participants were selected from undergraduate introductory psychology courses after completing a series of prescreening questionnaires (phase 1; see below for details). For the laboratory portion of the study (phase 2), participants were selected among phase 1 participants for a future interactive task scheduling session. The final sample size was 990 for phase 1 with the mean age of 21.21 years ($SD = 4.41$; 730 females, 260 males). The final sample size for phase two was 200 with 16 partial completes (either did not complete the first phase or the second phase) with the mean age of 20.98 years ($SD = 4.62$; 137 females, 44 males).

Measures

Phase 1: Prescreening Survey

Multicultural Personality Questionnaire. The MPQ consists of 91 items (see Appendix) that measure five subscales of cultural empathy, open-mindedness, social initiative, emotional stability, and flexibility (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000). Cultural empathy (14 items) measures the ability to empathize with the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of individuals from a different culture (Van Oudenhoven & Van der Zee, 2002). Open-mindedness (14 items) evaluates how open and unprejudiced the participants' attitude is towards different groups and cultures. Emotional stability (20 items) was defined as a tendency to remain calm in stressful situations. Flexibility (12 items) is operationalized as a tendency to adjust one's behavior to different circumstances within a foreign culture. Lastly, social initiative (17 items) refers to the tendency to take the initiative in social situation. Participants respond using a 5-point scale for all items (1 = not at all applicable to 5 = totally applicable). Scores were then averaged within the

subscale items to create subscores for each dimension (alpha levels for each of the subscales is reported in Table 1).

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for MPQ, Big Five, RWA, and SDO

Scale	Alpha	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Cultural Empathy	0.88	3.90	0.53
Openmindedness	0.84	3.54	0.53
Social Initiative	0.87	3.35	0.58
Emotional Stability	0.82	3.00	0.50
Flexibility	0.69	3.00	0.40
Extroversion	0.85	3.27	0.77
Agreeableness	0.75	3.85	0.59
Conscientiousness	0.78	3.65	0.62
Neuroticism	0.80	2.97	0.74
Openness	0.74	3.56	0.56
Social Dominance Orientation	0.89	2.59	1.09
Right Wing Authoritarianism	0.76	3.75	0.76

Social Dominance Orientation. Participants completed the 16-item SDO scale (Pratto et al., 1994), assessed using 7-point scales (1 = do not agree at all, to 7 = strongly agree) for questions about group hierarchy and social dominance. Higher scores indicate a higher social dominant attitude in which respondents support the current social structure to maintain their position.

Right Wing Authoritarianism – Short Version. Zakrisson (2005) developed a short, 15-item version of the RWA scale that removed references to specific groups (women, homosexuals, etc), condensed the length of the scale from its original 30-item length, and reduced the strong correlation with the SDO scale. The scale was reduced by systematically removing the items in the scale that contributed the least to the overall reliability. Items were then included to counter-balance the scale (Zakrisson, 2005). Items are measured on a 7-point

scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree) and an un-weighted mean is used as an overall score. Higher scores indicate greater right wing authoritarian attitudes.

Big Five Inventory. The Big Five Inventory was administered in which participants rated themselves on a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) on 44 items assessing the dimensions of openness, agreeableness, extraversion, neuroticism, and conscientiousness. The items were averaged according to their dimension to create total scores ranging from 1-5 (maximum score depends on the dimension).

Prejudice Scales. Binder et al.'s (2009) prejudice scales assessing affective and behavioral components of prejudice were used. Negative intergroup emotions were evaluated using six items (alphas ranging from .62 to .85) in which participants identified their feelings toward the outgroups (African-American, Caucasian, Latino, and Asian) using four positive (relaxed, peaceful, hopeful, calm) and eight negative (anxious, frustrated, angry, depressed, worried, nervous, irritated, and sad) adjective ratings using a 5-point scale (1 = very much, 5 = not at all). Positive items were reverse-coded and overall mean scores were computed for an overall prejudiced attitude rating. Higher values indicated more negative emotions. Behavioral prejudice was assessed by measuring desire for social distance through five items asking how much participants would like or be bothered by having outgroup classmates, teachers, neighbors, house guests, or in-laws. Lower values indicated more desire for social distance. These scales were used rather than the modern racism scale or other prejudice assessments because it was less direct about racist topics, such as religion and sexual preference.

Phase 2: Behavioral Assessment

Approach Behavior. Approach behavior was measured by the participants' ratings on how willing they would be to work with other participants based on a short profile. Participants

viewed five profiles, each containing information about the individual's age, gender, ethnicity, year in school, and major. The information for age, year in school, and major were assigned to the profiles for each participant using a Latin square design. Gender was held constant, such that participants only viewed profiles of prospective partners of the same-gender. The ethnicities for the profiles included two ingroup profiles and three outgroup profiles. For example, a Caucasian participant rated two Caucasian profiles, one African-American profile, one Asian profile, and one Latino/a profile. Ratings were made on a 7-point scale (1 = *I do not want to interact with this person at all*; 7 = *I would very much like to interact with this person*). A second measure, in which the participant ranked the profiles in order of preference to work with the individuals, was obtained after the participant viewed and rated all the profiles (1 = *like to interact with the most* to 5 = *like to interact with the least*). The rank order was then coded as either ingroup (1) or outgroup (0). To create an overall ingroup preference score, a weight was applied to each rank and then the weighted ranks were added together (e.g. (rank1*5) + (rank2*4) + (rank3*3) + (rank4*2) + (rank5*1) = ingroup preference score).

After rating the potential partners, participants also had the option to indicate whether they would rather complete the next phase by themselves (see below for details).

Procedure

Participants completed the study in two parts: an online survey portion and then a follow-up laboratory component. Only participants completed the prescreen items were eligible to participate in the laboratory portion of the study. The initial phase of the study, completed online using surveymonkey, consisted of the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire, Right Wing Authoritarian scale, Social Dominance Orientation scale, Prejudice scales, and demographic

questions (such as age, gender, ethnicity). In order to reduce variability, the ethnicities of participants were restricted to only Caucasian, African-American, Asian, and Hispanic subjects.

Upon completion of the first phase, participants were eligible to sign up for the second phase. Participants arrived at the laboratory and were taken to a room with a computer and informed consent was obtained. After the consent process, participants identified at least three times slots they had available during the following two weeks on a paper calendar. They then completed a short demographic profile in which they indicated their age, gender, major, ethnicity, and year in school.

Once the participants identified available times for the follow-up social interaction and completed their demographic information profile, the following script was used to explain the later social interaction setting, “Please rate the following profiles according to your desire to interact with each of the individuals to complete a task. The task will be a social problem solving task, in which you spend time getting to know each other and solving a social problem. It may be a problem-solving task, in which you work together to identify solutions to various problems and puzzles. It is possible to complete the task individually, if you choose, but it has been found to be easier to complete with a partner.”

Participants were then presented with the profiles of five (bogus) potential partners, and were instructed to rate each profile based on their desire to interact with that particular individual in the later phase of the study. A total of five profiles were presented to the participant in this manner; two profiles that matched the participant’s ethnicity and three that did not (e.g., if the participant was Caucasian then they rated two Caucasian profiles, one Hispanic profile, one Asian profile, and one African-American profile). After rating each individual profile the participant was presented with the profiles again in order to rank them overall in order of

preference. The profiles consisted of five pieces of basic information: age, gender, major, ethnicity, and year in school. Profiles were presented in random order based on a Latin square design to reduce bias created by the order of the profiles.

The profiles were rated first on a 7-point scale (1=*strongly dislike*, 4=*no strong preference*, 7= *strongly like*), asking participants: “Please indicate how strongly you would like or dislike working/interacting with each individual. Keep in mind that during the next phase you will be interacting in a social setting with at least one of these individuals. Your name and other identifying information will not be connected to your responses. Your responses will be recorded and matched to other participants’ ratings of your profile using a numerical code that maintains your anonymity.”

Participants were then able to view each of the profiles and rate each profile individually. Once they completed the initial rating, they were asked to rank order the individuals based on their overall preference to work with them, with 1 as the most preferred and 5 as the least.

At this point, they indicated (without being able to go back and change their previous ratings) their preference for interacting with others in the next phase, or for completing that phase by themselves. This preference was assessed with (a) the following 5-point (1=*strongly agree*, 5=*strongly disagree*) item, “I would rather complete the next session alone than with others”; and (b) with a forced-choice item, “Please check one of the following options:” followed by a selection between “I would prefer to work with another person in the next phase” and “I would prefer to work by myself in the next phase”. During debriefing, participants were informed that a follow-up portion was not going to be conducted.

Chapter 3

Results – What was Found?

Scores were computed for each participant in phase 1 on each dimension of the MPQ and BFI, total scores for RWA and SDO, and attitude scores toward each of the three outgroups were also computed (four total measures: participants of each ethnicity assessed the other three outgroup ethnicities (Table 2)). The approach behaviors of ingroup rank score and overall profile assessment were computed for phase 2. Means, standard deviations, and reliabilities for all measures are provided in Table 1.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Prejudice Variables

Scale	Alpha	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Prejudice towards African Americans	0.78	2.96	0.80
Prejudice towards Asians	0.86	2.88	0.93
Prejudice towards Hispanics	0.81	2.91	0.82
Prejudice towards Caucasians	0.87	2.87	0.93

Pearson's correlation coefficients were computed for the subscales of the MPQ, BFI, RWA, and SDO (Table 3). Correlations among the MPQ subscales are consistent with previous literature suggesting that the dimensions measure related constructs but do not completely overlap. MPQ subscales and BFI subscales were also found to be correlated, but with the exception of Extroversion and Social Initiative and Neuroticism and Emotional Stability, the relationships indicated unique construct measurement.

Table 3
Correlation Matrix for Predictor and Control Variables

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Cultural Empathy	-												
2. Openmindedness	.64**	-											
3. Social Initiative	.41**	.43**	-										
4. Emotional Stability	.09**	.23**	.44**	-									
5. Flexibility	.07*	.22**	.33**	.31**	-								
6. Extroversion	.20**	.20**	.76**	.32**	.28**	-							
7. Agreeableness	.39**	.26**	.27**	.21**	.17**	.12**	-						
8. Conscientiousness	.28**	.25**	.43**	.34**	-0.05	.21**	.43**	-					
9. Neuroticism	-0.04	-0.16**	-0.32**	-.78**	-.27**	-.21**	-.32**	-.38**	-				
10. Openness to Experience	.41**	.54**	.32**	.21**	.29**	.14**	.25**	.22**	-.16**	-			
11. Social Dominance Orientation	-.29**	-.25**	-.12**	0	-.11**	-0.04	-.30**	-.19**	0.05	-.14**	-		
12. Right Wing Authoritarianism	-0.05	-.16**	.11**	0.04	-0.05	.11**	.10**	.08*	-0.06	-.11**	.16**	-	
13. Social Desirability	0.02	-0.03	-0.06	-.25**	-0.03	-0.03	0.02	-.15**	.23**	-0.06	-.07*	0.04	-

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. Control variable included

Phase 1 Results: Personality Predicts Prejudiced Attitudes

A hierarchical regression model was used to test the first hypothesis that greater degrees of open mindedness, emotional stability, and cultural empathy will have an inverse effect on prejudiced attitudes above and beyond the BFI subscales, RWA, and SDO. In order to remove the effect of ingroup attitudes, participants were removed from the model that predicted prejudice towards their own ingroup, such that African-Americans' attitudes were not included in the model predicting prejudice against African-Americans. Four models were conducted in order to assess prejudiced attitudes towards each of the four outgroups (African-Americans, Caucasians, Hispanics, and Asians).

Prejudice Against African-Americans

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted using the subscales of the BFI, RWA, and SDO in the first step and the subscales of the MPQ in the second step, in order to predict

attitudes toward African-Americans. The first step accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in prejudice, $F(8, 751) = 4.55, p < .001$, with R^2 at .05. As predicted, the second step accounted for a significantly higher proportion of the variance in prejudice against African-Americans $\Delta F(5, 738) = 3.67, p = .003$, with ΔR^2 at .02 (individual predictor variable statistics presented in Table 4). In the final model, SDO, RWA, open mindedness, and openness to experience were found to be significant positive predictors of prejudice and cultural empathy was found to be a significant negative predictor of prejudice. Although SDO, RWA, and cultural empathy were in the predicted directions, open mindedness and openness to experience were not.

Table 4
*Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Prejudice Attitudes
Towards African Americans*

Predictor	b	<i>t</i>	<i>sr</i> ²
Step 1			
RWA	0.10	2.45*	0.02
SDO	0.11	3.324**	1.35
Openness to Experience	0.12	2.17*	0.61
Agreeableness	-0.11	-1.95*	0.49
Step 2			
RWA	0.10	2.50*	0.79
SDO	0.11	3.36***	1.66
Openness to Experience	0.14	2.20*	0.61
Cultural Empathy	-0.10	-3.95***	1.96
Openmindedness	0.17	2.19*	0.61

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. Control variable included Social Desirability Scale

Prejudice Against Caucasians

In this analysis, predicting prejudice attitudes against Caucasians, the first regression step accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in prejudice, $F(8, 290) = 1.99, p = .05$, with R^2 at .05. The second step did not account for a significantly higher proportion of the

variance in prejudice against Caucasians $\Delta F(5, 285) = 1.15, p = .33$, with ΔR^2 at .02, but the model was still marginally significant $F(13, 285) = 1.67, p = .067$, with R^2 at .07 (individual predictor variable statistics presented in Table 5). Only openness to experience was found to be a significant positive predictor of prejudice, suggesting that the more open an individual is to new experiences the more prejudice they report, which was opposite of the predicted direction.

Table 5
Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Prejudice Attitudes Towards Caucasians

	Predictor	b	<i>t</i>	<i>sr</i> ²
Step 1				
	Openness to Experience	0.26	2.73**	2.43
Step 2				
	Openness to Experience	0.30	2.81**	2.56

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. Control variable included Social Desirability Scale

Prejudice Against Hispanics

In this analysis predicting prejudice attitudes against Hispanics, the first regression step accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in prejudice, $F(8, 637) = 5.29, p < .001$, with R^2 at .06. As predicted, the second model accounted for a significantly higher proportion of the variance in prejudice against Hispanics $F(13, 632) = 3.38, p = .005$, with ΔR^2 at .02 ($F(13, 632) = 4.61, p < .001$, with R^2 at .09; individual predictor variable statistics presented in Table 6). In the final model, SDO and Openness to Experience were significant positive predictors

while cultural empathy and flexibility were significant negative predictors of prejudice attitudes towards Hispanics.

Table 6
*Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Prejudice Attitudes
Towards Hispanics*

Predictor	b	<i>t</i>	<i>sr</i> ²
Step 1			
SDO	0.12	3.92***	2.25
Openness to Experience	0.19	3.17**	1.49
Agreeableness	-0.13	-1.94*	0.55
Step 2			
SDO	0.11	3.52***	1.80
Openness to Experience	0.25	3.59***	1.85
Cultural Empathy	-0.30	-3.40***	1.66
Flexibility	-0.21	-2.20*	0.71

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. Control variable included Social Desirability Scale

Prejudice Against Asians

In this analysis predicting prejudice against Asians, the first regression step accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in prejudice, $F(8, 692) = 2.59, p = .009$, with R^2 at .03. As predicted, the second model accounted for a significantly higher proportion of the variance in prejudice against Asians $\Delta F(5, 687) = 5.38, p < .001$, with ΔR^2 at .04 ($F(13, 687) = 3.71, p < .001$, with R^2 at .07; individual predictor variable statistics presented in Table 7). In the final model, SDO, Openness to Experience, Extroversion, and open mindedness were significant

positive predictors while cultural empathy, social initiative, and emotional stability were significant negative predictors of prejudice attitudes towards Asians.

Table 7
*Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Prejudice Attitudes
Towards Asians*

Predictor	b	<i>t</i>	<i>sr</i> ²
Step 1			
SDO	0.11	3.24**	1.46
Openness to Experience	0.14	2.09*	0.61
Step 2			
SDO	0.10	2.91**	1.14
Openness to Experience	0.21	2.70**	1.00
Extroversion	0.14	2.02*	0.55
Cultural Empathy	-0.30	-3.20**	1.39
Open mindedness	0.19	2.01*	0.55
Social Initiative	-0.26	-2.28*	0.71
Emotional Stability	-0.26	-2.25*	0.69

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. Control variable included Social Desirability Scale

The strongest (negative) predictor of prejudice across all the models was cultural empathy. Cultural empathy is one's ability to accurately perceive and reflect the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of members from other cultures (Van der Zee, 2004). The next strongest predictor of prejudice was openness to experience, although this relationship was consistently in the opposite direction that was predicted. The more open to experience, the more prejudiced were the attitudes.

Phase 2 Results: Personality Predicts Approach Behaviors

Behavioral approach measures of ingroup preference profile rank (outgroup preference profile rank is the inverse of ingroup profile rank), overall ingroup evaluation, and overall

outgroup evaluation were computed and correlated with phase 1 outgroup attitudes. To test face validity, these criterion variables were also correlated with the two items indicating the participant's preference to work alone or with a partner (all results presented in Table 8).

Table 8
Correlation Matrix for Criterion Variables

Measure	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Rank Score Ingroup	4.73	2.91									
2. Ingroup Evaluation	3.82	1.87	.653***	-							
3. Outgroup Evaluation	4.36	1.57	0.114	.228**	-						
4. Prejudice towards African America	3.15	1.00	-0.036	-0.007	-.157*	-					
5. Prejudice towards Asians	3.02	1.05	-0.024	-0.064	-0.137	.809***	-				
6. Prejudice towards Hispanics	3.06	1.04	-0.091	-0.107	-.154*	.819***	.793***	-			
7. Prejudice towards Caucasians	1.03	1.57	0.039	-.146*	-0.121	0.14	.167*	0.125	-		
8. Work alone (rating scale)	3.13	1.46	.341***	.463***	.383***	-0.03	-0.054	-0.059	-0.052	-	
9. Work alone (dichotomous)	1.13	0.52	.266***	.205***	.417***	-0.008	0.021	0.02	-0.114	0.116	-

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$.

Attitudes (from phase 1) towards African-Americans ($r = -.16$) and Hispanics ($r = -.15$) were significantly negatively correlated with outgroup evaluation, suggesting that as prejudice levels increase the desire to work with an outgroup member decreases ($p < .05$). A significant negative correlation was found between prejudice towards Caucasians and ingroup evaluation, suggesting that as prejudice levels increased towards Caucasians the less the respondents wanted to work with their own ingroup ($r = -.15$; $p < .05$).

No significant correlation was found between the two items assessing preference to work alone or with a partner. Further examination of the data suggested that when participants were allowed to select from a wider range of options, they chose to select 'no preference' (unanchored scale midpoint) rather than identifying a directional choice ($M = 3.13$, $SD = 1.46$). When this choice was removed, the majority of the respondents opted to work with a partner rather than work alone. The resultant lack of relationship between these two items can be partially explained by this discrepancy.

Multiple linear regression models were conducted in order to test the hypothesis that the MPQ subscales can predict approach behaviors above and beyond other personality and social

measures (BFI, RWA, and SDO). Neither the overall model nor the base model significantly predicted ingroup rank score (the desire to work with an ingroup member based on the rank score assigned), $F(13, 170) = .72, p = .74$ with R^2 at .05.

The full multiple regression model significantly predicted ingroup evaluation above and beyond the partial, non-significant base model, $\Delta F(5, 168) = 2.39, p = .04$ with ΔR^2 at .06 [base model $F(8, 173) = 1.08, p = .38$ with R^2 at .05]. Within the model, cultural empathy ($b = .99, t(168) = 2.09, p = .04, sr^2 = 2.31\%$) was a significant positive predictor, and open mindedness ($b = -.96, t(168) = -2.10, p = .04, sr^2 = 2.34\%$) and emotional stability ($b = -.87, t(168) = 2.08, p = .04, sr^2 = 2.31\%$) were negative predictors of ingroup evaluation (desire to work with other ingroup members). Neither the overall model nor the base model significantly predicted outgroup evaluation (the desire to work with an outgroup member), $F(13, 167) = .82, p = .64$ with R^2 at .25.

Although the results do not support the final hypothesis that the MPQ subscales of open mindedness and social initiative would predict a greater inclination to engage in a future problem solving task with an outgroup member, some group differentiation was seen through respondents' higher favorability towards the ingroup. Ingroup profile evaluations were more favorable and were predicted by the MPQ subscales of cultural empathy, open mindedness, and emotional stability above and beyond the other personality measures.

Chapter 4

Discussion and Conclusions – MPQ predicts Prejudice but not always Approach Behavior

The findings of phase 1 indicate partial support for the primary hypothesis that the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire subscales predict prejudiced attitudes more effectively than previously researched and validated measures such as the Big Five Inventory, Social Dominance Orientation, Right Wing Authoritarianism. In partial support of the (first) secondary hypotheses – namely, that open-mindedness, emotional stability, and cultural empathy would be the strongest predictors of prejudiced attitudes – cultural empathy, open mindedness, and flexibility were significant predictors in the various models. The (second) secondary hypothesis, that the MPQ subscales of open mindedness and social initiative would be the strongest predictors of approach behaviors, was not supported. Although the hypothesis was not supported, the model predicting ingroup evaluation was significantly predicted by cultural empathy, social initiative, and open mindedness.

Cultural empathy was the strongest, most consistent negative predictor of prejudiced attitudes. Cultural empathy, or one's ability to accurately perceive and understand the thoughts and feelings of someone from a different culture (Van der Zee, 2004), has also been referred to as one's 'sensitivity' to others from another culture (Hawes and Kealey, 1981). Similar to empathic accuracy, or one's ability to judge another's short-term state (Ickes, 1993), cultural empathy is the degree in which a person is able to fully comprehend what the other person is experiencing – even though the two individuals do not share the same cultural norms. By seeing the other person as an individual with relatable thoughts and feelings, the intergroup boundaries

are potentially softened. Consistent with Brewer and Miller's (1986; see also Miller, 2002) decategorization theory as well as the multiple group identifications of crossed categorization – the idea of transcending or blurring group boundaries to some degree seems to reduce prejudiced attitudes.

Although not a consistent predictor of prejudiced attitudes towards all outgroups, open mindedness was a significant, positive, predictor of prejudice against African-Americans. Open mindedness, or the tendency to be non-judgmental and racially/ethnically-tolerant, was expected to be a negative predictor of prejudice. Closer examination of the items that compose the open mindedness scale suggest face validity consistent with the definition as well as with the predicted direction (sample items include: “Is interested in other cultures” “Is fascinated by other people’s opinions” “Finds other religions interesting” “Tries out various approaches” “Is intrigued by differences” “Gets involved in other cultures” “Has a feeling for what is appropriate in another culture” “Seeks contact with people from different backgrounds” “Puts his/her own culture in perspective” “Is open to new ideas”). One direct criticism of these items is that there is a high degree of social desirability built into them – an individual is far more likely to rate themselves highly on the items ‘open to new ideas’ and ‘is fascinated by other people’s opinions’ when their actual behavior suggests otherwise. Taking an interest in another group and studying them from afar involves less risk than actually engaging in contact, even if it is lower, less threatening levels. This discrepancy between interest, attitudes, and full engagement in approach behaviors should be examined further in order to understand the interplay among the degrees of true intergroup openness.

When predicting prejudice towards Hispanics, flexibility was found to be a strong negative predictor; the more flexible you are the less prejudice you report towards Hispanics.

Flexibility, or one's ability to switch from one thing to another based on cultural norms of the situation they are in, is an important trait when interacting with others and your primary goal is to reach common ground. The Hispanic culture is known to have larger families, which encourages flexibility to achieve the collective as well as individual family members' goals. Perhaps it is the case that this cultural characteristic may carry over into the way in which they interact with other cultural and ethnic groups, which may in turn reflect on how these outgroups interact with Hispanics.

Although this research has begun to merge two bodies of literature, there are some limitations as well as further directions to explore. Due to the scope of this research, the in-lab assessment of behavioral approach was limited to a hypothetical interaction. The participants were led to believe that they would be interacting with another person of their choice, but an actual face to face interaction in which participants were allowed to choose a partner they could see in the same room would have been telling in a different way. This conclusion can be made from the results of the item in which respondents indicated their preference to work either alone or with another participant. The largest percentage of participants (35.9%) selected the central point of the scale, suggesting no real opinion one way or the other. If their potential interaction partners were there in the same room when they were making their selection choices, they may have been more inclined to select their preference rather than indicate no opinion of working with another person or alone.

Although prejudiced attitudes towards outgroup members has been studied extensively, further work on what behaviors people engage in based on these attitudes needs to be studied further. Refinements of behavioral measures that indicate an intergroup preference should be examined in order to overcome social desirable responses and an ever accepting outward social

perspective. Prejudiced attitudes are no longer expressed openly, but are manifested in indirect ways, such as subtle behaviors. Further understanding of the discriminatory actions between groups will enhance new developments of prejudice research.

Appendix A

Multicultural Personality Questionnaire

To what extent do the following statements apply to you?

(Please circle the answer that is most applicable to you)

1 = Totally not applicable 2 = hardly applicable 3 = moderately applicable 4 = largely applicable
5 = completely applicable

1. Likes low-comfort holidays	1	2	3	4	5
2. Takes initiative	1	2	3	4	5
3. Is nervous	1	2	3	4	5
4. Makes contacts easily	1	2	3	4	5
5. Is not easily hurt	1	2	3	4	5
6. Is troubled by conflicts with others	1	2	3	4	5
7. Finds it difficult to make contacts	1	2	3	4	5
8. Understands other people's feelings	1	2	3	4	5
9. Keeps to the background	1	2	3	4	5
10. Is interested in other cultures	1	2	3	4	5
11. Avoids adventure	1	2	3	4	5
12. Changes easily from one activity to another	1	2	3	4	5
13. Is fascinated by other people's opinions	1	2	3	4	5
14. Tries to understand other people's behavior	1	2	3	4	5
15. Is afraid to fail	1	2	3	4	5
16. Avoids surprises	1	2	3	4	5
17. Takes other people's habits into consideration	1	2	3	4	5
18. Is inclined to speak out	1	2	3	4	5
19. Likes to work on his/her own	1	2	3	4	5
20. Is looking for new ways to attain his/her goal	1	2	3	4	5

21. Dislikes travelling	1	2	3	4	5
22. Wants to know exactly what will happen	1	2	3	4	5
23. Remains calm in misfortune	1	2	3	4	5
24. Waits for others to initiate contacts	1	2	3	4	5
25. Takes the lead	1	2	3	4	5
26. Is a slow starter	1	2	3	4	5
27. Is curious	1	2	3	4	5
28. Takes it for granted that things will turn out right	1	2	3	4	5
29. Is always busy	1	2	3	4	5
30. Is easy-going in groups	1	2	3	4	5
31. Finds it hard to empathize with others	1	2	3	4	5
32. Functions best in a familiar setting	1	2	3	4	5
33. Radiates calm	1	2	3	4	5
34. Easily approaches other people	1	2	3	4	5
35. Finds other religions interesting	1	2	3	4	5
36. Considers problems solvable	1	2	3	4	5
37. Works mostly according to a strict scheme	1	2	3	4	5
38. Is timid	1	2	3	4	5
39. Knows how to act in social settings	1	2	3	4	5
40. Likes to speak in public	1	2	3	4	5
41. Tends to wait and see	1	2	3	4	5
42. Feels uncomfortable in a different culture	1	2	3	4	5

43. Works according to plan	1	2	3	4	5
44. Is under pressure	1	2	3	4	5
45. Sympathizes with others	1	2	3	4	5
46. Has problems assessing relationships	1	2	3	4	5
47. Likes action	1	2	3	4	5
48. Is often the driving force behind things	1	2	3	4	5
49. Leaves things as they are	1	2	3	4	5
50. Likes routine	1	2	3	4	5
51. Is attentive to facial expressions	1	2	3	4	5
52. Can put setbacks in perspective	1	2	3	4	5
53. Is sensitive to criticism	1	2	3	4	5
54. Tries out various approaches	1	2	3	4	5
55. Has ups and downs	1	2	3	4	5
56. Has fixed habits	1	2	3	4	5
57. Forgets setbacks easily	1	2	3	4	5
58. Is intrigued by differences	1	2	3	4	5
59. Starts a new life easily	1	2	3	4	5
60. Asks personal questions	1	2	3	4	5
61. Enjoys other people's stories	1	2	3	4	5
62. Gets involved in other cultures	1	2	3	4	5
63. Remembers what other people have told	1	2	3	4	5
64. Is able to voice other people's thoughts	1	2	3	4	5
65. Is self-confident	1	2	3	4	5

66. Has a feeling for what is appropriate in another culture	1	2	3	4	5
67. Gets upset easily	1	2	3	4	5
68. Is a good listener	1	2	3	4	5
69. Worries	1	2	3	4	5
70. Notices when someone is in trouble	1	2	3	4	5
71. Has good insight into human nature	1	2	3	4	5
72. Is apt to feel lonely	1	2	3	4	5
73. Seeks contact with people from different backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
74. Has a broad range of interests	1	2	3	4	5
75. Is insecure	1	2	3	4	5
76. Has a solution for every problem	1	2	3	4	5
77. Puts his or her own culture in perspective	1	2	3	4	5
78. Is open to new ideas	1	2	3	4	5
79. Is fascinated by new technological developments	1	2	3	4	5
80. Senses when others get irritated	1	2	3	4	5
81. Likes to imagine solutions for problems	1	2	3	4	5
82. Sets others at ease	1	2	3	4	5
83. Works according to strict rules	1	2	3	4	5
84. Is a trendsetter	1	2	3	4	5
85. Needs change	1	2	3	4	5
86. Pays attention to the emotions of others	1	2	3	4	5

87. Reads a lot	1	2	3	4	5
88. Seeks challenges	1	2	3	4	5
89. Enjoys getting to know others deeply	1	2	3	4	5
90. Enjoys unfamiliar experiences	1	2	3	4	5
91. Looks for regularity in life	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix B

Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale

Items in the revised, short version of the RWA scale (counter-balanced items in italics).

1 = very negative; 7 = very positive – unweighted mean where high values represent high authoritarian values.

1. Our country needs a powerful leader, in order to destroy the radical and immoral currents prevailing in society today.

2. Our country needs free thinkers, who will have the courage to stand up against traditional ways, even if this upsets many people.

3. The “old-fashioned ways” and “old-fashioned values” still show the best way to live.

4. Our society would be better off if we showed tolerance and understanding for untraditional values and opinions.

5. God’s laws about abortion, pornography and marriage must be strictly followed before it is too late, violations must be punished.

6. The society needs to show openness towards people thinking differently, rather than a strong leader, the world is not particularly evil or dangerous.

7. It would be best if newspapers were censored so that people would not be able to get hold of destructive and disgusting material.

8. Many good people challenge the state, criticize the church and ignore ‘the normal way of living’.

9. Our forefathers ought to be honored more for the way they have built our society, at the same time we ought to put an end to those forces destroying it.

10. People ought to put less attention to the Bible and religion, instead they ought to develop their own moral standards.

11. There are many radical, immoral people trying to ruin things; the society ought to stop them.

12. It is better to accept bad literature than to censor it.

13. Facts show that we have to be harder against crime and sexual immorality, in order to uphold law and order.

14. The situation in the society of today would be improved if troublemakers were treated with reason and humanity.

15. If the society so wants, it is the duty of every true citizen to help eliminate the evil that poisons our country from within.

Appendix C

Social Dominance Orientation Scale

1. Some groups of people are simply not the equals of others.
2. Some people are just more worthy than others.
3. This country would be better off if we cared less about how equal all people were.
4. Some people are just more deserving than others.
5. It is not a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others.
6. Some people are just inferior to others.
7. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on others.
8. Increased economic equality.
9. Increased social equality.
10. Equality.
11. If people were treated more equally we would have fewer problems in this country.
12. In an ideal world, all nations would be equal.
13. We should try to treat one another as equals as much as possible. (All humans should be treated equally.)
14. It is important that we treat other countries as equals.

All items were measured on a *very negative* (1) to *very positive* (7) scale. Items 8-14 were reverse-coded. The version of Item 13 in parentheses was used in Samples 5-12. The order of items differed from above and across samples.

Appendix D

The Big Five Inventory

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who likes to spend time with others? Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

Disagree strongly	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5

I See Myself as Someone Who...

- ___ 1. Is talkative.
- ___ 2. Tends to find fault with others.
- ___ 3. Does a thorough job.
- ___ 4. Is depressed, blue.
- ___ 5. Is original, comes up with new ideas.
- ___ 6. Is reserved.
- ___ 7. Is helpful and unselfish with others.
- ___ 8. Can be somewhat careless.
- ___ 9. Is relaxed, handles stress well.
- ___ 10. Is curious about many different things.
- ___ 11. Is full of energy.
- ___ 12. Starts quarrels with others.
- ___ 13. Is a reliable worker.
- ___ 14. Can be tense.
- ___ 15. Is ingenious, a deep thinker.

- ___ 16. Generates a lot of enthusiasm.
- ___ 17. Has a forgiving nature.
- ___ 18. Tends to be disorganized.
- ___ 19. Worries a lot.
- ___ 20. Has an active imagination.
- ___ 21. Tends to be quiet.
- ___ 22. Is generally trusting.
- ___ 23. Tends to be lazy.
- ___ 24. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset.
- ___ 25. Is inventive.
- ___ 26. Has an assertive personality.
- ___ 27. Can be cold and aloof.
- ___ 28. Perseveres until the task is finished.
- ___ 29. Can be moody.
- ___ 30. Values artistic, aesthetic experiences.
- ___ 31. Is sometimes shy, inhibited.
- ___ 32. Is considerate and kind almost every time.
- ___ 33. Does things efficiently.
- ___ 34. Remains calm in tense situations.
- ___ 35. Prefers work that is routine.
- ___ 36. Is outgoing, sociable.
- ___ 37. Is sometimes rude to others.
- ___ 38. Makes plans and follows through with them.

- ___ 39. Gets nervous easily.
- ___ 40. Likes to reflect, play with ideas.
- ___ 41. Has few artistic interests.
- ___ 42. Likes to cooperate with others.
- ___ 43. Is easily distracted.
- ___ 44. Is sophisticated in art, music

Appendix E

Intergroup Contact

Thinking of social contacts -- whether at home, or at work, or somewhere else -- how much contact do you have with [outgroup]... (please check one answer per question)

...at meetings or events?

___ 1 a great deal ___ 2 some ___ 3 a little ___ 4 none at all

...just chatting to people?

___ 1 a great deal ___ 2 some ___ 3 a little ___ 4 none at all

...over all social situations?

___ 1 a great deal ___ 2 some ___ 3 a little ___ 4 none at all

How many of your closest friends belong to this group?

___ none ___ one to five ___ six to ten ___ more than ten

How many of your immediate family members belong to this group?

___ none ___ very few ___ about half ___ most ___ all

During the average day, how many opportunities do you have for contact with [outgroup]?

0	1	2	3	4
None	very few	some	many	very many

How often do you see [outgroup] in the area where you live?

0	1	2	3	4
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often

What percentage of people in your home area would you guess are [outgroup]? _____ %

About how many neighbors do you have who are [outgroup]?

0	1	2	3	4
None at all	One	Two to five	Five to ten	More than ten

Appendix F

In-group Identification

I see myself as a [Ingroup].

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

Being a [Ingroup] is central to my sense of who I am.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

Overall, being a [Ingroup] has very little to do with how I feel about myself

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

Being a [Ingroup] is an important reflection of who I am.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

In general, being a [Ingroup] is an important part of my self-image.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

I value being a [Ingroup].

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

I feel proud to be a [Ingroup].

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

Being a [Ingroup] is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

I feel strong ties to [Ingroup].

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Oxford, England: Addison-Wesley.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing Authoritarianism*. Winnipeg Manitoba: The University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The “other” authoritarian personality. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.) *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 30, pp. 47-91). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Asbrock, F., Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2010). Right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation and the dimensions of generalized prejudice: A longitudinal test. *European Journal of Personality*, 24, 324-340.
- Binder, J., Zagefka, H., Brown, R., Funke, F., Kessler, T., Mummendey, A., Maquil, A., Demoulin, S., & Leyens, J.-P. (2009). Does contact reduce prejudice or does prejudice reduce contact? A longitudinal test of the contact hypothesis in three European countries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 843-856.
- Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. (1984). Beyond the Contact Hypothesis: Theoretical Perspectives on Desegregation. In N Miller & M B Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in Contact The Psychology of Desegregation* (pp. 281-302). Academic Press.
- Brewer, M. B, Ho, H. K., Lee, J. Y., & Miller, N. (1987). Social identity and social distance among Hong Kong school children. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 13, 156-165.
- Brown, R. & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.) *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol 37 pp. 255-343). San Diego, Elsevier Academic Press.

- Cairns, E. Kenworthy, J., Campbell, A., & Hewstone, M. (2006). The role of ingroup identification, religious group membership, and intergroup conflict in mediating in-group and out-group affect. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 45*, 701-716.
- Crisp, R. J. & Hewstone, M. (2000). Crossed Categorization and intergroup bias: The moderating roles of intergroup and affective context. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 357-383.
- Crisp, R. J. & Hewstone, M. (1999). Differential evaluation of crossed category groups: Patterns processes, and reducing intergroup bias. *Groups Processes & Intergroup relations, 2*, 307-333.
- Danso, H. A. & Esses, V. M. (2001). Black experimenters and the intellectual test performance of white participants: The tables are turned. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, 158–165.
- Dovidio, J. F., Brigham, J. C., Johnson, B.T., & Gaertner, S. L. (1996). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination: Another look. In C. N. Macrae, C. Stagnor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.) *Stereotypes and Stereotyping*, pp. 276-319. New York: Guilford.
- Duckitt, J., Wagner, C., Plessis, I., & Birum, I. (2002). The psychological bases of ideology and prejudice: Testing a dual process model. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 75-93.
- Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1997). Sticking together or falling apart: In-group identification as a psychological determinant of group commitment versus individual mobility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 617-626.
- Esses, V. M., Dovidio, J. F., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (2001). The immigration dilemma: The role of perceived group competition, ethnic prejudice, and national

- identity. In V. M. Esses, J. F. Dovidio & K. L. Dion, (Eds.), *Immigrants and immigration. Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 389–412
- Ickes, W. (1993). Empathic accuracy. *Journal of Personality*, 61, 587-610.
- Islam, M. R. & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived out-group variability, and out-group attitude: An integrative model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 700-710.
- Hawes, F. & Kealey, D. (1981). An empirical study of Canadian technical assistance: Adaptation and effectiveness on overseas assignment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 4, 239-258.
- Hewstone, M. & Brown, R. (Eds). (1986). *Contact and Conflict in intergroup encounters*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Hewstone, M., Islam, M. R., & Judd, C. M. (1993). Models of crossed categorization and intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 779-793.
- Hodson, G. (2008). Interracial prison contact: The pros for (socially dominant) cons. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 47, 325-351.
- Hodson, G. (2009). The puzzling person-situation schism in prejudice research. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 247-248.
- Leone, L., Van der Zee, K. I., van Oudenhoven, J. P., Perugini, M., & Ercolani, A. P. (2005). The cross-cultural generalizability and validity of the multicultural personality questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38, 1449-1462.
- Lindeman, M. (1997). Ingroup bias, self-enhancement and group identification. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 337-355.

- Miller, N. & Brewer, M. B. (1986). Categorization effects on ingroup and outgroup perception. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.) *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism*, pp. 209-230. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Miller, N. (2002). Personalization and the Promise of Contact Theory. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 387-410.
- Nesdale, D., Van Oudenhoven, M., & Pieter, J. (2012). Intercultural effectiveness, authoritarianism, and ethnic prejudice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42, 1173-1191.
- Pettigrew, T. F. & Troop, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 751-783.
- Pettigrew, T. F. & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 922-934.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763.
- Sibley, C. G. & Duckitt, J. (2008). Personality and prejudice: A meta-analysis and theoretical review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12, 248-279.
- Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Stangor, C., Sullivan, L. A., & Ford, T. E. (1991). Affective and cognitive determinants of prejudice. *Social Cognition*, 9, 359-380.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 157-175.

- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson.
- Urada, D., Stenstrom, D. M., & Miller, N. (2007). Crossed categorization beyond the two-group model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*, 649-664.
- Van Oudenhoven, J. P. & Van der Zee, K. I. (2002). Predicting multicultural effectiveness of international students: The multicultural personality questionnaire. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 26*, 679-694.
- Van der Zee, K., Atsma, N., & Brodbeck, F. (2004). The influence of social identity and personality on outcomes of cultural diversity in teams. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 35*, 283-303.
- Van der Zee, K. I. & Van Oudenhoven, J. P. (2000). The multicultural personality questionnaire: A multidimensional instrument of multicultural effectiveness. *European Journal of Personality, 14*, 291-309.
- Van der Zee, K. I., Zaal, J. N. & Piekstra, J. (2003). Validation of the multicultural personality questionnaire in the context of personnel selection. *European Journal of Personality, 17*, 77-100.
- Vescio, T. K., Sechrist, G., & Paolucci, M. P. (2003). Perspective taking and prejudice reduction: The meditational role of empathy arousal and situational attributions. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 455-472.
- Wilder, D. & Simon, A. F. (1998). Categorical and dynamic groups: Implications for social perception and intergroup behavior. In C. Sedikides & J. Schopler (Eds.) *Intergroup*

cognition and intergroup behavior. pp. 27-44. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Winter, D. G., John, O. P., Stewart, A. J., Klohnen, E. C., & Duncan, L. E. (1998). Traits and motives: Toward an integration of two traditions in personality research. *Psychological Review*, *105*, 230-250.

Zakrisson, I. (2005). Construction of a short version of the right wing authoritarian (RWA) scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *39*, 863-872.

Biographical information

Nicole Sharp has studied under Dr. Jared Kenworthy in the University of Texas at Arlington's Social and Intergroup Research Laboratory while completing her Masters of Science degree. She earned her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology degree from Truman State University in 2009 and plans to complete her Ph.D in Experimental Psychology from UT Arlington in May 2015. Her research interests include group dynamics, interpersonal interactions within group settings, and group defection.